



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,873	10/18/2001	Mikey Andrew Davis	AUS920010084US1	7089
35525	7590	02/02/2006	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA)			PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B	
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC			ART UNIT	
P.O. BOX 802333			PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75380			2154	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/981,873	Applicant(s) DAVIS ET AL.	
	Examiner Ashok B. Patel	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29 are subject to examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

Applicant's argument: Claim 1

"Mandahl does not teach the claimed feature of "directing the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the universal resource locator and the user identification" as recited in claim 1. The examiner incorrectly asserts otherwise."

" Mandahl, paragraph 0035. As can be seen in this cited section, Mandahl discloses the use of different components within an intranet. This section also teaches that these components are used to provide an authentication service. However, the step of receiving a request, wherein the request includes the universal resource locator and a user identification is not found in this cited section."

"Mandahl, paragraph 0039, This cited section in Mandahl teaches that a URL maybe registered as a service or application with the portal directory for access by a particular set of individuals. However, Mandahl, does not teach how this access occurs. In particular, no teaching is present for receiving a request, wherein the request includes the universal resource locator and a user identification. No mention of a request including a universal resource locator and a user identification is mentioned.

In addition, Mandahl's portal allows a particular individual access to different aspects of an application. However, Mandahl does not teach directing a request to a selected application

within the set of applications using the user identification and the *same URL that refers to the entire set of applications in the manner claimed.*"

"Additionally, paragraph 0039 does not teach that the request received by the portal is a combination of the authentication information **and** the URL as claimed."

"*Mandahl*, paragraph 0048..... Therefore, *Mandahl* does not teach the claimed step of "receiving a request, wherein the request includes the universal resource locator and a user identification."

Examiner's response:

Examiner had cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. Therefore, Examiner had requested that the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Mandahl's teachings must be given the context exactly as Mandahl wants to understand what Mandahl teaches which is disclosed by Mandahl at page 2, Para.[0016], "One widely used technique to overcome the problems of having multiple user authentications is to map all user logons in a secure data base. The user simply indicates a desire to access a particular service, and the stored user ID and password are retrieved from the secure data base, as indicated by the mapping to the

Art Unit: 2154

user's name, and are used as input for their service authentication. However, this technique requires that the secure database be updated for each new user, or whenever a new system is implemented. Further administration for the secure database is required if users must change their passwords or user ID periodically. This requirement places a large administrative burden on the individuals whose task it is to maintain the secure database. Again, this solution is somewhat resource intensive, and can be cumbersome when a large number of services are used by multiple departments."

Now that we know the context of Mandahl's teachings, examiner would like to present Mandahl's teachings in this very context step by step in relation with Claim 1 limitations: **Step 1:**

Mandahl teaches in para.[0034], "For example, a user associated with the organization may access intranet 16 using a remote workstation 26."

(Note: This user is accessing portal system 10 through Internet.)

Mandahl teaches in para.[0032], Portal system 10 is connected to an organization intranet 16 and provides portal services for users within the organization." And in para [0034], "Intranet 16 is also connected to an external internet 18 through a firewall 21."

(Note: An access to portal system is provided through Internet.)




Fig. 1

Art Unit: 2154

Step 2: Mandahl teaches the details of the portal system 10 in Fig. 2 along with its make up as well as functionalities of its components.

Mandahl teaches in para.[0036], "User connections to portal system 10 can be made in an on-line connection 110, and off-line connection 112 or a mobile connection 114. Each of the user connections interacts with an information interface 116, which exposes information interfaces for user access."

(Note: Connection to portal system is can be made on-line.)

Mandahl teaches in para.[0039], "Portal directory 120 interacts with various standard applications, services and data base engines through a connector layer 122. Connector layer 122 contains a number of interface translators or engines that provide a conduit between portal directory 120 and other services and applications. For example, a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) may be registered as a service or application with portal directory 120 for access by a particular set of individuals or groups. The URL may be tied to an application or service that is used to varying degrees by the individuals or groups to which it is allocated. For example, one user may require access to a certain aspect of a given service represented by a URL, while a group or department may wish to utilize a number of detailed aspects of the application or service."





Fig. 2

Note: "Portal directory 120 interacts with various standard applications, services and data base engines through a connector layer 122.", and " A Uniform Resource Locator (URL) may be registered as a service or application with portal directory 120 for access by a particular set of individuals or groups."

Step 3:

Mandahl teaches in para.[0049] "If the user requires further information than is provided by service summary 82, the user can then be specifically authenticated for access directly to the desired service. For example, if the user wishes to directly access service 86, the user request is passed through transaction server 80 to super user authentication 78. Super user authentication 78 contains a mapping of the user ID and password to all other application and service authentications. Once the user request is received by super user authentication 78, the appropriate authentication for service 86 is retrieved and applied by transaction server 80 to grant the user full, direct access to service 86."



Note: Please note the underlined teachings in this paragraph.

Thus, Mandahl provides the solution to the problem that overcomes the problems of having multiple user authentications is to map all user logons in a secure data base as stated in para.[0016] providing the context to develop the understanding on what Mandahl teaches.

Please refer to the notes provided above for the respective limitations .

Claim 1 recites, "A method in a data processing system for managing access to a set of applications associated with a universal resource locator (Note: This user is accessing portal system 10 through Internet.), (Note: An access to portal system is provided through Internet.), Note: Connection to portal system is can be made on-line.) the method comprising:

receiving a request, wherein the request includes the universal resource locator and a user identification ("For example, if the user wishes to directly access service 86, the user request is passed through transaction server 80 to super user authentication 78. Super user authentication 78 contains a mapping of the user ID and password to all other application and service authentications. Once the user request is received by super user authentication 78, the appropriate authentication for service 86 is retrieved and applied by transaction server 80 to grant the user full, direct access to service 86."), and

directing the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the universal resource locator and the user identification. (Note: "Portal directory 120 interacts with various standard applications, services and data base engines through a connector layer 122.", and " A Uniform Resource Locator (URL) may be registered as a service or application with portal directory 120 for access by a particular set of individuals or groups.")

Thus, Mandahl teaches the limitations of claim 1.

Applicant's argument: Claim 3

"Mandahl does not teach in the cited paragraphs or elsewhere that the user authentication uses a user name located within the request."

Examiner's response:

Please refer to the response for claim 1.

Applicant's argument: Claims 4 and 5

“Thus, the phrase "special software and applications for mobile related services that differ from those required by on-line connection 110 to view or manipulate the same information," as the examiner discerns *from Mandahl*, does *not* read on the feature of "a new version of the selected application," as *claimed in claim 4*, *Thus, Mandahl* doe's not anticipate claim 4 under 35 USC § 102. For the same reasons, *Mandahl* does not anticipate claim 5.”

Examiner's response:

Please refer to Mandahl as stated previously, page 4, para.[0043]. Mandahl teaches as claims 4 and 5 recite as previously stated.

Applicant's argument: Claim 7

“*Mandahl* does not teach the feature of "associating the plurality of applications with a first universal resource locator; assigning the plurality of applications with plurality of universal resource locators_ excluding the first universal resource locator." In *Mandahl*, applications have different URLs for the express purpose that they are used by the user through *those* different URLs. This fact is in stark contrast with the claimed *feature of "associating* the plurality of applications with a first universal resource locator; assigning the plurality of applications with plurality of universal resource locators excluding the first universal resource locator." In Applicants' claim, the application's assigned URL is not exposed to the requester; rather, the requester uses a common first URL to access *any of such applications from the set of applications*. On the other hand, *Mandahl* 's teaches managing access to the various applications and services by a variety of users and user-groups.”

Examiner's response:

Please refer to the response for claim 1.

35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness:

Applicant's argument: Claims 2, 8, 13, 19, 22 and 28

“However, *Lee* does not teach or *suggest* that the source identification *is the IP* address of a node originating the request. *Lee* simply states that a source identifier is provided along with an application program that is to be provided by a Web server.”

Examiner's response:

Lee teaches in col. 3, line 9-16, “An application program that is to be provided by a Web server along with a source identifier is received by the Web server via a network, such as, the Internet. The source identifier functions as an indication of sponsorship. The entity sponsoring, or vouching for, the reliability of the application program signs the application program. Thus, the level of trust afforded the signing entity is granted to applications programs signed by that entity.” Thus Lee teaches that the source identification is the IP address of a node originating the request.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18, 20, 21, 23-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mandahl et al. (hereinafter Mandahl) (US 2002/0091639 A1).

Referring to claim 1,

Mandahl teaches a method in a data processing system for managing access to a set of applications associated with a universal resource locator (page 2, para.[0039]), the method comprising:

receiving a request, wherein the request includes the universal resource locator and a user identification (page 3, para.[0035],[0039]); and

directing the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the universal resource locator and the user identification. (page 3, para.[0035],[0038],[0039], "Portal directory 120 provides the facilities for application and service access, individual user personalization, user authentication, information flow, group membership and access; and user profile information, among others. Portal directory 120 can accommodate any number of applications and services through the use of component object models (COM) and registration within portal directory 120. COM constructs provide standardized interfaces for access to complex applications and services. Registration of an application or service in portal system 10 provides a reserved allocation of resources and a known connection." and "For example, a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) may be registered as a service or application with portal directory 120 for access by a particular set of individuals or groups. The URL may be tied to an application or service that is used to varying degrees by the individuals or groups to which it is allocated. For example, one user may require access to a certain aspect of a given service represented by a URL, while a group or department may wish to utilize a number of detailed aspects of the application or service.")

Art Unit: 2154

Referring to claim 3,

Mandahl teaches the method of claim 1. wherein the user identification is a user name located within the request. (page3, para.[0035],[0038],[0039], page 4, para.[0048], "Portal directory 120 provides the facilities for application and service access, individual user personalization, user authentication, information flow, group membership and access; and user profile information, among others. Portal directory 120 can accommodate any number of applications and services through the use of component object models (COM) and registration within portal directory 120. COM constructs provide standardized interfaces for access to complex applications and services. Registration of an application or service in portal system 10 provides a reserved allocation of resources and a known connection.")

Referring to claims 4 and 5,

Mandahl teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising: replacing the selected application with a new selected application, and the method of claim 4, wherein the new selected application is a new version of the selected application. (page 4, para.[0043], "An application server 130 provides application and services resources to various individuals and groups through portal directory 120. For example, mobile connection 114 may require special software and applications for mobile related services that differ from those required by on-line connection 110 to view or manipulate the same information. The application and software that permits mobile connection user 114 to manipulate information also accessible to on-line connection 110 can be stored on application server 130.")

Art Unit: 2154

Referring to claim 6,

Mandahl teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each application within the set of applications is assigned to a different universal resource locator (page 4, para.[0039]) and wherein the directing step comprises:

identifying the set of applications using a corresponding universal resource locator;

identifying a selected application from the set of applications based on the user identification; and

sending the request to the selected application using an assigned universal resource locator assigned to the selected applications. (page 4, para.[0039], "Portal directory 120 interacts with various standard applications, services and data base engines through a connector layer 122. Connector layer 122 contains a number of interface translators or engines that provide a conduit between portal directory 120 and other services and applications. For example, a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) may be registered as a service or application with portal directory 120 for access by a particular set of individuals or groups. The URL may be tied to an application or service that is used to varying degrees by the individuals or groups to which it is allocated. For example, one user may require access to a certain aspect of a given service represented by a URL, while a group or department may wish to utilize a number of detailed aspects of the application or service." Thus, the reference teaches the claimed elements.")

Referring to claim 7,

Art Unit: 2154

Mandahl teaches a method in a data processing system for managing access to a plurality of applications, the method comprising:

associating the plurality of applications with a first universal resource locator;

assigning the plurality of applications with plurality of universal resource locators

excluding the first universal resource locator;

receiving a request including the first universal resource locator and an identification of a user; and

redirecting the request using the first universal resource locator to a particular application within the plurality of applications using a particular universal resource locator associated with the particular application based on the identification. (page3, para.[0035],[0038],[0039], "Portal directory 120 provides the facilities for application and service access, individual user personalization, user authentication, information flow, group membership and access; and user profile information, among others. Portal directory 120 can accommodate any number of applications and services through the use of component object models (COM) and registration within portal directory 120. COM constructs provide standardized interfaces for access to complex applications and services. Registration of an application or service in portal system 10 provides a reserved allocation of resources and a known connection." and "Portal directory 120 interacts with various standard applications, services and data base engines through a connector layer 122. Connector layer 122 contains a number of interface translators or engines that provide a conduit between portal directory 120 and other services and applications. For example, a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) may be registered as a

Art Unit: 2154

service or application with portal directory 120 for access by a particular set of individuals or groups. The URL may be tied to an application or service that is used to varying degrees by the individuals or groups to which it is allocated. For example, one user may require access to a certain aspect of a given service represented by a URL, while a group or department may wish to utilize a number of detailed aspects of the application or service." Thus, the reference teaches the claimed elements.)

Referring to claim 9,

Mandahl teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the identification is a user name. (page3, para.[0035],[0038],[0039], page 4, para.[0048], "Portal directory 120 provides the facilities for application and service access, individual user personalization, user authentication, information flow, group membership and access; and user profile information, among others. Portal directory 120 can accommodate any number of applications and services through the use of component object models (COM) and registration within portal directory 120. COM constructs provide standardized interfaces for access to complex applications and services. Registration of an application or service in portal system 10 provides a reserved allocation of resources and a known connection.")

Referring to claim 10,

Mandahl teaches data processing system comprising: a bus system; a communications unit connected to the bus system; a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions and a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit executes the set of

Art Unit: 2154

instructions (page 2, para.[0021]); to receive a request in which the request include the universal resource locator and a user identification; and direct the request to a selected application within the set of applications using the universal resource locator and the user identification. (page 4, para.[0039]).

Referring to claim 11,

Claim 11 is a claim to a data processing system that carries out the method steps of claim 7. Therefore claim 11 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 7 and page 2, para.[0021].

Referring to claim 12,

Claim 12 is a claim to a data processing system that carries out the method steps of claim 1. Therefore claim 12 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1.

Referring to claim 14,

Claim 14 is a claim to a data processing system that carries out the method steps of claim 3. Therefore claim 14 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 3.

Referring to claims 15 and 16,

Claims 15 and 16 are claims to a data processing system that carries out the method steps of claims 4 and 5. Therefore claims 15 and 16 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claims 4 and 5.

Referring to claim 17,

Claim 17 is a claim to a data processing system that carries out the method steps of claim 6. Therefore claim 17 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 6.

Referring to claim 18,

Art Unit: 2154

Claim 18 is a claim to a data processing system that carries out the method steps of claim 7. Therefore claim 18 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 7.

Referring to claim 20,

Claim 20 is a claim to a data processing system that carries out the method steps of claim 9. Therefore claim 20 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 9.

Referring to claim 21,

Claim 21 is a claim to computer program products in a computer readable medium that carries out the method steps of claim 1. Therefore claim 21 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1.

Referring to claim 23,

Claim 23 is a claim to computer program products in a computer readable medium that carries out the method steps of claim 3. Therefore claim 23 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 3.

Referring to claims 24 and 25,

Claims 24 and 25 are claims to computer program products in a computer readable medium that carries out the method steps of claims 4 and 5. Therefore claims 24 and 25 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claims 4 and 5.

Referring to claim 26,

Claim 26 is a claim to computer program products in a computer readable medium that carries out the method steps of claim 6. Therefore claim 26 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 6.

Referring to claim 27,

Claim 27 is a claim to a computer program products in a computer readable medium that carries out the method steps of claim 7. Therefore claim 27 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 7.

Referring to claim 29,

Claim 29 is a claim to computer program products in a computer readable medium that carries out the method steps of claim 9. Therefore claim 29 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 8, 13, 19, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mandahl et al. (hereinafter Mandahl) (US 2002/0091639 A1). in view of Lee et al. (herein after Lee) (US 6, 167, 522).

Referring to claim 2,

Keeping in mind the teachings of Mandahl, Mandahl specifically fails to teach the method of claim 1, wherein the user identification is an internet Protocol address of a node originating the request.

Lee teaches in col. 3, line 9-16, "An application program that is to be provided by a Web server along with a source identifier is received by the Web server via a network, such as, the Internet. The source identifier functions as an indication of sponsorship.

The entity sponsoring, or vouching for, the reliability of the application program signs the application program. Thus, the level of trust afforded the signing entity is granted to applications programs signed by that entity.” Thus Lee teaches that the source identification is the IP address of a node originating the request.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one in ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the teachings of Lee to Mandahl’s system such that, as taught by lee, The source identifier functions as an indication of sponsorship. The entity sponsoring, or vouching for, the reliability of the application program signs the application program. Thus, the level of trust afforded the signing entity is granted to applications programs signed by that entity.

Referring to claim 8,

Keeping in mind the teachings of Mandahl, Mandahl specifically fails to teach The method of claim 7, wherein the identification is an Internet Protocol address.

Lee teaches in col. 3, line 9-16, “An application program that is to be provided by a Web server along with a source identifier is received by the Web server via a network, such as, the Internet. The source identifier functions as an indication of sponsorship. The entity sponsoring, or vouching for, the reliability of the application program signs the application program. Thus, the level of trust afforded the signing entity is granted to applications programs signed by that entity.” Thus Lee teaches that the source identification is the IP address of a node originating the request.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one in ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the teachings of Lee to Mandahl’s system such

Art Unit: 2154

that, as taught by lee, The source identifier functions as an indication of sponsorship.

The entity sponsoring, or vouching for, the reliability of the application program signs the application program. Thus, the level of trust afforded the signing entity is granted to applications programs signed by that entity.

Referring to claim 13,

Claim 13 is a claim to a data processing system that carries out the method steps of claim 2. Therefore claim 13 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 2.

Referring to claim 19,

Claim 19 is a claim to a data processing system that carries out the method steps of claim 8. Therefore claim 19 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 8.

Referring to claim 22,

Claim 22 is a claim to computer program products in a computer readable medium that carries out the method steps of claim 2. Therefore claim 22 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 2.

Referring to claim 28,

Claim 28 is a claim to computer program products in a computer readable medium that carries out the method steps of claim 8. Therefore claim 28 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 8.

Conclusion

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are

applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2154

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100